

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

RYAN PFLIPSEN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	
	)	FILE No. 5:20-cv-624
RAY RONDEL & MICAH RONDEL	)	
d/b/a SENECA PLAZA,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, RYAN PFLIPSEN, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendants RAY RONDEL & MICAH RONDEL d/b/a SENECA PLAZA, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff RYAN PFLIPSEN (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in San Antonio, Texas

(Bexar County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of asserting his civil rights, monitoring, ensuring, and determining whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others, and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this Property, including returning to the Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).”

7. Defendants RAY RONDEL and MICAH RONDEL d/b/a SENECA PLAZA (hereinafter “Seneca Plaza”) are two individual Texas residents operating a for profit retail “strip mall” that transacts business in the state of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Seneca Plaza may be properly served with process at the following location: Ray Rondel and Micah Rondel, 6504 Bandera Road, San Antonio, Texas 78238.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9. On or about December 27, 2019, Plaintiff was a customer at “Social Cutz,” a business located at 6515 Bandera Road, San Antonio, Texas 78238, referenced herein as “Social Cutz.”

10. Seneca Plaza is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that the Social Cutz are situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

11. Plaintiff lives approximately 7 miles from the Social Cutz and Property.

12. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 6515 Bandera Road, San Antonio, Bexar County Property Identification number 448138 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendants are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Social Cutz, including those set forth in this Complaint.

13. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property within six months or sooner, as soon as the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a regular customer, to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

14. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Social Cutz and Property to purchase goods and/or services.

15. Plaintiff travelled to the Social Cutz and Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access at the Social Cutz and Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Social Cutz and Property.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

16. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

17. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and

- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

18. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

\* \* \* \* \*

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

19. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

20. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

21. The Social Cutz is a public accommodation and service establishment.

22. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

23. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the

Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

24. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

25. The Social Cutz must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

26. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

27. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Social Cutz and the Property in his capacity as a customer of the Social Cutz and Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Social Cutz and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Social Cutz and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

28. Plaintiff intends to visit the Social Cutz and Property again in the very near future as a customer in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Social Cutz and Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA

violations that exist at the Social Cutz and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Social Cutz and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

29. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Social Cutz and Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

30. Defendants will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Social Cutz and Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Social Cutz and Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

31. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Social Cutz and Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Social Cutz and Property include, but are not limited to:

**(a) ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:**

- (i) Near Unit 6515, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section

502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(ii) Near Unit 6515, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(iii) Near Unit 6555, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(iv) Near Unit 6555, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(v) The accessible parking space adjacent to Unit 6555 has vertical rises in excess of ¼ inch in height and is in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to traverse the accessible parking space.

(vi) The maneuvering clearance serving the accessible entrance to Unit 6555 is not level in violation of section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards.



This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to enter this Unit.

- (vii) Near Unit 6515, the accessible ramp side flares have a slope in excess of 1:10 in violation of section 406.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (viii) For multiple units of the property, including Units 6521, 6523, 6525, 6527 and 6529, the doorway of the accessible entrance is not level in violation of section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (ix) The Property lacks a single accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, due to the presence of stairs along the accessible route between Units 6529 and 6531, the Property lacks an accessible route. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (x) Near Unit 6533, the accessible parking space is missing a proper identification sign in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- (xi) Near Unit 6533, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous

and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xii) Near Unit 6533, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(xiii) Near Unit 6533, the accessible ramp side flares have a slope in excess of 1:10 in violation of section 406.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xiv) Near Unit 6541, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xv) Near Unit 6541, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(xvi) Near Unit 6541, the accessible parking space and associated access aisle have a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This violation made it dangerous and

difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xvii) Near Unit 6541, the accessible parking space sign is not at the proper height in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

(xviii) The Property lacks an accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, due to the presence of stairs along the accessible route near Unit 6553, the Property lacks an accessible route. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.

(xix) Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled Unit 6515, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xx) Near Unit 6515, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

- (xxi) Near Unit 6555, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (xxii) Near Unit 6555, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.
- (xxiii) The accessible parking space adjacent to Unit 6555 has vertical rises in excess of  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch in height and is in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to traverse the accessible parking space.
- (xxiv) The maneuvering clearance serving the accessible entrance to Unit 6555 is not level in violation of section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to enter this Unit.
- (xxv) Near Unit 6515, the accessible ramp side flares have a slope in excess of 1:10 in violation of section 406.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxvi) For multiple units of the property, including Units 6521, 6523, 6525, 6527 and 6529, the doorway of the accessible entrance is not level in violation of section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxvii) The Property lacks a single accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, due to the presence of stairs along the accessible route between Units 6529 and 6531, the Property lacks an accessible route. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.

(xxviii) Near Unit 6533, the accessible parking space is missing a proper identification sign in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

(xxix) Near Unit 6533, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xxx) Near Unit 6533, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the

2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(xxxi) Near Unit 6533, the accessible ramp side flares have a slope in excess of 1:10 in violation of section 406.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxxii) Near Unit 6541, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xxxiii) Near Unit 6541, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(xxxiv) Near Unit 6541, the accessible parking space and associated access aisle have a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xxxv) Near Unit 6541, the accessible parking space sign is not at the proper height in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

(xxxvi) The Property lacks an accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Specifically, due to the presence of stairs along the accessible route near Unit 6553, the Property lacks an accessible route. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.

(xxxvii) Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

32. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Social Cutz and Property.

33. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Social Cutz and Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Social Cutz and Property in violation of the ADA.

34. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

35. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Social Cutz and Property into compliance with the ADA.

36. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Social Cutz and Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

37. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Social Cutz and Property is readily achievable because Defendants have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the Social Cutz and Property have been altered since 2010.

39. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

40. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendants are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Social Cutz and Property, including those alleged herein.

41. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

42. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants.

43. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.



44. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants to modify the Social Cutz and Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find the Social Cutz in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Social Cutz to make them readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: May 26, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dennis R. Kurz

Dennis R. Kurz

*Attorney-in-Charge for Plaintiff*

Texas State Bar ID No. 24068183

Kurz Law Group, LLC

4355 Cobb Parkway, Suite J-285

Atlanta, GA 30339

Tele: (404) 805-2494

Fax: (770) 428-5356

Email: [dennis@kurzlawgroup.com](mailto:dennis@kurzlawgroup.com)